

REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been amended and Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and again examine the claims as amended.

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claim 15 is allowed. Claims 1-17 and 20-22 are rejected. Claims 18, 19 and 23 are objected to. Claims 1, 19, 20 and 23 are amended herein. Claim 18 is cancelled.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ben-Eli (US 6873661). Claims 3, 4, 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Eli (US 6873661) in view of Young et al (US 5570392). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Eli (US 6873661) in view of Glas et al (US 6560296). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Eli (US 6873661) in view of Iwamatsu et al (US 5648988). Claims 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Eli (US 6873661) in view of Stanley et al (US20020141440). Claims 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Eli (US 6873661) in view of Blomenkamp (US 3959586) and further in view of Clark et al (US 4736362).

The Examiner objected to Claim 18 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicates that Claim 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to incorporate all of the limitations of Claim 18 into Claim 1 and Claim 1 should now be allowable.

Claims 2-17 and 19 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 1 and should now be allowable.

Applicants submit that Claim 20 is patentably distinct over Ben-Eli (US 6873661) in view of Blumenkamp (US 3959586) and further in view of Clark et al (US 4736362), since the cited references neither describes nor suggests "a plurality of coefficient memories ...; a plurality of first registers ...; a plurality of negative value circuits ...; a plurality of 2:1 multiplexors ...; a plurality of second registers ...; and an adder ...; wherein coefficient values at an instance in time are each indicative by a digital word and wherein one of the digital words and a corresponding negative value of the digital word are selected in response to the baseband signal and the selected digital words are summed to provide the baseband signal."

Claims 21 to 22 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 20 and should thus be allowable.

The Examiner objected to Claim 23 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicates that Claim 23 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Applicants have amended Claim 23 to incorporate all of the limitations of Claim 20 and 22 into Claim 23 and Claim 23 should now be allowable.

In view of the above Amendment and Remarks, Applicants submit that the Claims and the entire case are in condition for allowance and should be sent to issue and such action is respectfully requested.


The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney if there are any questions regarding this Response or this application.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication including the costs associated with the additional independent claim or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500845, including but not limited to, any charges for extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 1, 2007

DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE, LLP

By:   
Donald F. Mofford  
Reg. No. 33,740  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A  
Canton, MA 02021-2714  
Tel.: (781) 401-9988, Ext. 113  
Fax: (781) 401-9966  
*dfm@dc-m.com*

59401